

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,209	10/24/2003	Ming-Chin Chang	250122-1040	2288
24504	7590 02/14/2006		EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP			VU, PHU	
100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA,	GA 30339-5948		2871	
			DATE MAIL ED: 02/14/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

()	P	/
"		

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/693,209	CHANG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Phu Vu	2871	

D f // E'' f A /D' f		O1 1/ 1/ O E1 / \(\text{L}\).					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
·	Phu Vu	2871					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	HE REPLY FILED 23 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on		) and the annionriate exte	ension fee have				
been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee attory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
	but prior to the data of filing a brid	f will not be entered	hecause				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		•					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	elected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a))		,					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendmen	(PTOL-324).				
5. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	allowable if submitted in a separate	, timely filed amendn	nent canceling				
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		vill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-20</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>17-20</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after	entry is below or atta	ched.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application	in condition for allowa	ance because:				
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)	(PTO/SR/08 or PTO-1440) Papar	No(s)					
13. Other:	. (F10/06/06 01 F10-1449) Paper	140(5).					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that that one of ordinary skill in that art would not have been motivated to place planarization layer over the color filters of Bjilsma due to the fact that color filters form a flat surface. However the cited reference "Suzuki" teaches forming of a planarization layer to protect the color as well as perform planarization therefore, one would have been motivated to add a planarization layer to at least protect the color filter. Furthermore fig. 4 of the reference also shows gaps in the color filter (fig. 4 above element 13) wherein the boundaries between these and the color filter elements can cause a discontinuity in the flatness of the surface. Applicant has also argued that that coating a full color resist of the reference with another element would result in unstable production yield however applicant has provided no evidence to support this conclusion. Additionally applicant has argued that the rejection relies on impermissable hindsight and that application of Suzuki is a broad and omnibus and that allows combining Suzuki with any such layer that needs protection. This is found unpersuasive as Suzuki teaches formation of a protection layer that is located in a specific position and is limited to only on a color filter.

ANDREW SCHECHTER PRIMARY EXAMINER